

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 requires that an EIR include a description of the existing environment. More specifically, Section 15125(a) states that an EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. The City previously prepared an IS/MND for the proposed Project (City of Glendale and Stantec, 2018). The Final Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the proposed Project concluded that the proposed Project would not result in potentially significant and unavoidable environmental impacts; however, City of Glendale Planning Commission elected not to adopt the Final IS/MND and requested preparation of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. While this EIR provides updates to the proposed Project's previous environmental analysis to address comments received during the public hearing considering adoption of the previous IS/MND and the public scoping meetings for preparation of this EIR, much of the environmental baseline established during preparation of the previous IS/MND has been utilized for purposes of this EIR to provide a comparative evaluation of the potential environmental impacts of alternatives to the proposed Project (refer to Section 5.0 for a discussion of alternatives to the proposed Project). However, the environmental baseline was updated in this EIR for air quality, biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and hazards and hazardous materials refer to Section 1.2.3).

Each environmental topic studied in Section 4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis (Sections 4.1 through 4.14), analyzes the proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans. This section provides a general overview of the environmental setting for the proposed Project. Detailed information on environmental conditions is provided for each environmental topic studied in Section 4.0. This section also provides a list of related projects that are considered in cumulative impact analysis.

3.1 OVERVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1.1 On-Site Conditions

The proposed Project site is located at 3001 Scholl Canyon Road (Assessor Parcel Number 566602901), in the City of Glendale, and is situated along the eastern-most border of the City (**Figure 2.2-1**). The approximately 2.2-acre Project site is currently occupied with the SCLF and would be located on the approximately 95-acre Los Angeles County portion of the SCLF, within the City of Glendale. SCLF is zoned SR (Special Recreation), with a corresponding General Plan Land Use designation of Recreation/Open Space.^{8,9}

⁸ City of Glendale Community Development Department, City of Glendale Zoning Map, September 11, 2014. <https://www.glendaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=654>. Accessed April 30, 2019.

⁹ City of Glendale Community Development Department, City of Glendale Comprehensive General Plan Land Use Element Map, September 4, 2018. <https://www.glendaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=47607>. Accessed April 30, 2019.



GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project site is exclusively accessed by Scholl Canyon Road, which is a two-lane road that terminates at the SCLF. Figueroa Street turns into Scholl Canyon Road at State Route 134 (Ventura Freeway). Regional access to the proposed Project site is from the Ventura Freeway and Figueroa Street. State Route 210 (Foothill Freeway) is aligned farther north of the proposed Project site, and the State Route 2 (Glendale Freeway) is aligned farther west of the proposed Project site. The Project site is not served by public transportation; however, bus service in the vicinity is provided by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

3.1.2 Surrounding Uses

The land uses surrounding the proposed Project site include low density residential and very low density/open space land uses. Immediately to the south of the proposed Project site is the City of Los Angeles community of Eagle Rock, and to the east of the proposed Project site is the City of Pasadena, including Arroyo Seco Park and Rose Bowl Stadium.

3.1.3 Existing Conditions

For more detailed descriptions of existing conditions specific to each of the environmental issues analyzed in this Draft EIR, see Sections 4.1 through 4.14.

3.2 RELATED PROJECTS AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The State CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. As set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(3), "cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(3), a project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. In addition, the Lead Agency is required to identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) further provides that the discussion of cumulative impacts reflects the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. Rather, the discussion is to be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) states that complying with one of the following two protocols is necessary to provide an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

1. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or



GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2. A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program. Any such document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the Lead Agency.

Cumulative study areas are defined based on an analysis of the geographical scope relevant to each particular environmental issue. Therefore, the cumulative study area for each individual environmental impact issue may vary. For example, a cumulative land use impact generally may only affect the compatibility of uses within the vicinity of a project site, while a cumulative air quality impact may affect the entire air basin.

In order to determine which projects would be considered as potential related projects, research was conducted during May and June 2019, including outreach to neighboring municipalities and agencies. Research was conducted online for each entity, (including the City of Glendale, Glendale Water and Power, City of Pasadena, Pasadena Water and Power, City of Burbank, Burbank Water and Power, City of La Canada-Flintridge, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning). Additionally, telephone discussions with agency representatives were conducted to describe the proposed Project and to obtain information about the potential projects under their jurisdiction which could contribute to cumulative environmental impacts. The agencies and representatives consulted are included in Section 8.0 Projects identified through these correspondences and screened for potential evaluation in the proposed Project's cumulative impact analysis is summarized below. Based on distance and lack of comparable environmental impacts which could have a cumulative effect, only one project was considered relevant and carried forward into the cumulative impact analysis.

City of Glendale and Glendale Water & Power:

1. Grayson Repowering Project – Located approximately five-miles west of the proposed Project. Electrical repowering project, including replacement of generation units with new, cleaner, efficient, reliable power generation facilities. The City of Glendale is currently evaluating specific equipment and layouts and is evaluating the potential impacts of the Grayson Repowering project through preparation of an EIR. The Grayson Repowering Project **was** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
2. Scholl Canyon Landfill Expansion – The City of Glendale previously proposed to expand the SCLF. The Landfill Expansion is no longer proposed, is no longer reasonably foreseeable and, as such, **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impacts analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
3. Anaerobic Digester Project – The City of Glendale previously considered constructing and operating an Anaerobic Digester Project at the SCLF. The Anaerobic Digester Project would anaerobically digest organic waste and would combust the produced gas in electrical generating equipment to produce renewable electricity. The Anaerobic Digester Project is no longer proposed, is no longer reasonably foreseeable and, as such, **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impacts analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.



GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

City of Pasadena and Pasadena Water and Power:

4. Holly Street Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project – Located approximately two miles southeast of the proposed Project. This project would retrofit an existing bridge over the Arroyo Seco. The City of Pasadena indicated that required bridge and street closures could potentially cause emergency access issues and wildfire emergency egress issues for the Linda Vista community. The proposed Project does not spatially overlap with the bridge retrofit project, would not contribute to traffic congestion in the area of the Holly Street Bridge and would not have the potential to contribute to impacts to the Linda Vista community. Therefore, the Holly Street Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
5. Annandale Canyon Open Space Trail Access Improvements and Park Expansion – Located approximately 2/3 of a mile west of the proposed Project. This project consists of trail construction, trailhead improvements, construction of a small parking lot, accessibility improvements, and acquisition of neighboring parcels to expand park footprint. The City of Pasadena reports that this project would be completed in 2019, which is before the timeline for implementation of the proposed Project. Due to the different timing, lack of spatial overlap, minor nature of recreation improvements, and distinctly different project types, the Annandale Canyon Open Space Trail Access Improvements and Park Expansion **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
6. ArtCenter College of Design Master Plan Project – Located one mile north of the proposed Project. This project consists of improvements within the ArtCenter Hillside Campus, including renovations, reconstruction, and additions to existing buildings, construction of additional parking, installation of a CNG fueling facility and photovoltaic (PV) solar cell canopies within the parking lots, and modifications to campus access. Due to the distance from proposed Project activities, distinctly different project types, and the use of a separate roadway system and transportation infrastructure, as compared to the proposed Project, the ArtCenter College of Design Master Plan Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
7. Berkshire Creek Area Improvements Project – Located approximately 3 miles north of the proposed Project. This project site consists of approximately 4.7 acres within the Oak Grove area of the City of Pasadena's approximate 1,300-acre Hahamongna Watershed Park. The Oak Grove area is situated in the southwestern portion of the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan area. The primary goal of this project is to improve the ecological, hydrological, and recreational conditions throughout the lower third of the Oak Grove area. This is a small park improvement project with beneficial attributes that would not have overlapping impact types, when considered in combination with the proposed Project. Due to the distance, distinctly different project types, the lack of overlapping impact types, and use of a separate roadway system and different transportation infrastructure compared to the proposed Project, the Berkshire Creek Area Improvements Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
8. Glenarm II Rebuild/Retrofit/Refurbishment Project – Located approximately three and ¼ miles southeast of the proposed Project. This project would rebuild the portion of the Glenarm Power Plant that burned down in 2012. Due to the distance from the proposed Project and lack of additional information available, the Glenarm II Rebuild/Retrofit/Refurbishment Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analysis including in Section 4.0 of this EIR.
9. Sunset Reservoir Ion Exchange Project – Located approximately three and ¼ miles east of the proposed Project. This project involves a groundwater treatment system and includes an



DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
CITY OF GLENDALE BIOGAS RENEWABLE GENERATION PROJECT

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

aboveground aqueous ammonia tank and other large chemical tanks. Due to the distance to the proposed Project, the very small total size of the project site and water treatment tanks, and the fact there were no significant environmental impacts associated with this project, the Sunset Reservoir Ion Exchange Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.

City of Burbank and Burbank Water and Power:

10. Burbank Landfill LFG Microturbine Replacement – Located seven and ¾ miles northwest of the proposed Project. This project would replace LFG burning microturbines which have reached the end of their life. Manufactured “skid units” would be placed on site as a new system to improve biogas reclamation. Burbank Water and Power indicated that this was a very small project and not comparable in scale to the proposed Project. There would be no potential for this project and the proposed Project to have any overlapping or cumulative impacts. As a result, and in consideration of the distance from the proposed Project, the Burbank Landfill LFG Microturbine Replacement Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.

City of La Canada-Flintridge:

11. There are **no applicable projects** to consider in La Canada-Flintridge, other than the Devil’s Gate Sediment Removal Project (discussed below).

City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power:

12. There were **no applicable projects** to consider in the City of Los Angeles or proposed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Los Angeles County:

13. Devil’s Gate Sediment Removal Project – Located approximately three and ¼ miles north to the proposed Project. This project involves sediment removal from Devil’s Gate Reservoir. Through 2022, 1.7 million cubic yards of sediment will be removed from Devil’s Gate Reservoir, with habitat restoration taking place through 2023. There would be minimal, if any, potential for cumulative environmental impacts to occur, as limited number of construction trucks accessing the proposed Project site would not be in the vicinity of Devil’s Gate Reservoir. Due to the distance, distinctly different project types, and use of a separate roadway system and different transportation infrastructure as compared to the proposed Project, the Devil’s Gate Sediment Removal Project **was not** carried forward to the cumulative impact analyses included in Section 4.0 of this EIR.

The only related project is the GWP’s Grayson Repowering Project, located approximately five miles west of the proposed Project site. The Grayson Repowering Project would be undertaken at GWP’s existing Grayson Power Plant. A majority of the facilities located at the Grayson Power Plant, with the exception of Unit 9 (a simple cycle peaking plant built in 2003), were completed between 1941 and 1977, and are proposed to be replaced with more reliable, efficient, flexible, and cleaner units and related facilities and infrastructure. The City is currently evaluating repowering alternatives for the Grayson Power Plant.



**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
CITY OF GLENDALE BIOGAS RENEWABLE GENERATION PROJECT**

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The cumulative analysis for each environmental issue, including a discussion regarding the identification of relevant related projects, is provided in Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis, of this Draft EIR.

